DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Peterson Builders Inc Plant 2				
107 Walnut Street, Sturgeon Bay, WI				
WID096828975				
pole relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the nedia, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units gulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI determination?				
If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.				
Ì				

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

2.	Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective "levels" (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?					
	If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.					
	X If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."					
	If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.					
	Rationale and Reference(s):					

Footnotes:

¹"Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate "levels" (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

Has the migration of contaminated groundwater stabilized (such that contaminated groundwater is

3.

	sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of t "existing area of groundwater contamination".
-	If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination" ²) - sl to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after providing an explanation.
_	If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

² "existing area of contaminated groundwater" is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of "contamination" that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all "contaminated" groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of "contaminated" groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

	If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.
	If no - skip to #7 (and enter a "YE" status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater "contamination" does not enter surface water bodies.
	If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.
Ration	nale and Reference(s):

•	If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration ³ of key contaminants
	discharged above their groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," a if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the
	discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to ha unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.
	If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration ³ of <u>each</u> contaminant discharged above its groundwater "level the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentration greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater "levels," the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into
	surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.
	If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

³ As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

Can the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be "currently

acceptable" (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed

6.

	If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site=s surface water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater;
	OR 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment, ⁵ appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is (in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors
	If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be "currently acceptable") - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.
	If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.
Rationale and	Reference(s):

⁴ Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

⁵ The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

 If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which wil be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the "existing area of groundwater contamination."
 If no - enter "NO" status code in #8.
If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

	e CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) si ion below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as w		
X	YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Undo Based on a review of the information contained in this determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Grou (FACILITY NAME) facility, EPA ID # (ENTER EPA STATE). Specifically, this determination indicates the groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing This determination will be re-evaluated when the Age changes at the facility.	EI determendwater" is A ID NUM at the migres be conducted a rea of c	ination, it has been s "Under Control" at the IBER), located at (CITY, ration of "contaminated" ted to confirm that ontaminated groundwater"
	NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater	er is observ	ed or expected.
	IN - More information is needed to make a determination.		
Completed by:	(signature) Michelle Mullin	Date	3/28/11
	(print) Michelle Mullin		
	(title) Corrective Action Project Manager	_	
Supervisor:	(signature) Maf 9. H	Date	3/21/11
	(print) Mark Gordon	_	
•	(title) Section Chief, Policy and Technical Resources		
	(EPA Region or State) WDNR Central Office		
Locations	where References may be found:		
2984 Sha	Northeast Region Office awano Ave ay, WI 54313	,	
Contact tel	ephone and e-mail numbers		
	(name) Mark Gordon		
	(phone #) (608) 266-7278		
	(e-mail) Mark.Gordon@wisconsin.gov		

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)

Current Human Exposures Under Control

Facility Name:	Peterson Builders Inc Plant 2
Facility Address:	107 Walnut Street, Sturgeon Bay, WI
Facility EPA ID #:	WID096828975
groundwate	lable relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, r, surface water/sediments, and air, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste t Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in mination?
_X	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.
· .	If no - re-evaluate existing data, or
	If data are not available skip to #6 and enter"IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI

A positive "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that there are no "unacceptable" human exposures to "contamination" (i.e., contaminants in concentrations in excess of appropriate risk-based levels) that can be reasonably expected under current land- and groundwater-use conditions (for all "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI are for reasonably expected human exposures under current land- and groundwater-use conditions ONLY, and do not consider potential future land- or groundwater-use conditions or ecological receptors. The RCRA Corrective Action program so overall mission to protect human health and the environment requires that Final remedies address these issues (i.e., potential future human exposure scenarios, future land and groundwater uses, and ecological receptors).

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air media known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action (from SWMUs, RUs or AOCs)?

·	Yes	No	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants				
Groundwater		X						
Air (indoors) ²		X						
Surface Soil (e.g., <	2 ft)	X						
Surface Water		X						
Sediment		X						
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >	2 ft)	X						
Air (outdoors)		X						
ap de If "cr de suj	 If no (for all media) - skip to #6, and enter "YE," status code after providing or citing appropriate "levels," and referencing sufficient supporting documentation demonstrating that these "levels" are not exceeded. If yes (for any media) - continue after identifying key contaminants in each "contaminated" medium, citing appropriate "levels" (or provide an explanation for the determination that the medium could pose an unacceptable risk), and referencing supporting documentation. If unknown (for any media) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code. 							
Rationale and Refere	ence(s):							

Footnotes:

¹ "Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (for the media, that identify risks within the acceptable risk range).

² Recent evidence (from the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, and others) suggest that unacceptable indoor air concentrations are more common in structures above groundwater with volatile contaminants than previously believed. This is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration necessary to be reasonably certain that indoor air (in structures located above (and adjacent to) groundwater with volatile contaminants) does not present unacceptable risks.

3. Are there **complete pathways** between "contamination" and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land- and groundwater-use) conditions?

Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table

Potential Human Receptors (Under Current Conditions)

Contaminated Media	Residents	Workers	Day Care	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	Food ³
Groundwater							
Air (indoors)							
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)							······
Surface Water							
Sediment			(- //-/				
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)							
Air (outdoors)							

Instructions for Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table:

1. Strike-out spe	ecific Media inclu	ding Human	Receptors.	spaces fo	or Media	which :	are not
"contaminated") as identified in #	2 above.					

	2.	enter	``yes"	or or	"no"	for potential	"completeness"	under each	"Contaminated"	Media -
- Humai	n Re	eceptor	r comi	bina	ation	(Pathway).				

Note: In order to focus the evaluation to the most probable combinations some potential "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combinations (Pathways) do not have check spaces ("___"). While these combinations may not be probable in most situations they may be possible in some settings and should be added as necessary.

	If no (pathways are not complete for any contaminated media-receptor combination) - skip to #6, and enter "YE" status code, after explaining and/or referencing condition(s) in-place, whether natural or man-made, preventing a complete exposure pathway from each contaminated medium (e.g., use optional <u>Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet</u> to analyze major pathways).
	If yes (pathways are complete for any "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combination) - continue after providing supporting explanation.
	If unknown (for any "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combination) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code
Rationale and R	eference(s):

³ Indirect Pathway/Receptor (e.g., vegetables, fruits, crops, meat and dairy products, fish, shellfish, etc.)

Can the exposures from any of the complete pathways identified in #3 be reasonably expected to be "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable" because exposures can be reasonably expected to be: 1) greater in magnitude (intensity, frequency and/or duration) than assumed in the derivation of the acceptable "levels" (used to identify the "contamination"); or 2) the combination of exposure magnitude (perhaps even though low) and contaminant concentrations (which may be substantially above the acceptable "levels") could result in greater than acceptable risks)?
If no (exposures can not be reasonably expected to be significant (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "YE" status code after explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."
If yes (exposures could be reasonably expected to be "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - continue after providing a description (of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure pathway) and explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the remaining complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."
If unknown (for any complete pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code
Rationale and Reference(s)

⁴ If there is any question on whether the identified exposures are "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") consult a human health Risk Assessment specialist with appropriate education, training and experience.

If yes (all "significant" exposures have been shown to be within acceptable limits) - continue and enter "YE" after summarizing <u>and</u> referencing documentation justifying why all "significant" exposures to "contamination" are within acceptable limits (e.g., a site-specific Human Health Risk Assessment).
If no (there are current exposures that can be reasonably expected to be "unacceptable") continue and enter "NO" status code after providing a description of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure.
If unknown (for any potentially "unacceptable" exposure) - continue and enter "IN" status code

6.

(CA725), and	ropriate RCRIS status codes for the Current Human Exposures Under Control EI event code obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below propriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility):					
X	YE - Yes, "Current Human Exposures Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI Determination, "Current Human Exposures" are expected to be "Under Control" at the (FACILITY NAME) facility, EPA ID # (ENTER EPA ID NUMBER), located at (CITY, STATE) under current and reasonably expected conditions. This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency/State becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.					
	- "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Under Control."					
	IN - More information is needed to make a determination.					
Completed by:	(signature) Michelle Mullin Date 3/28/11					
	(print) Michelle Mullin					
	(title) Corrective Action Project Manager					
Supervisor:	(signature) MIS. M. Date 3/21/11					
	(print) Mark Gordon					
	(title) Section Chief, Policy and Technical Resources					
	(EPA Region or State) WDNR Central Office					
Locations whe	ere References may be found:					
WDNR Nort	heast Region Office					
2984 Shawano Ave						
Green Bay, V	W1 54313					
Contact teleph	one and e-mail numbers					
(name) Mark Gordon					
(phone	e #) (608) 266-7278					
(e-ma	il) Mark.Gordon@wisconsin.gov					

FINAL NOTE: THE HUMAN EXPOSURES EI IS A QUALITATIVE SCREENING OF EXPOSURES AND THE DETERMINATIONS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE SOLE BASIS FOR RESTRICTING THE SCOPE OF MORE DETAILED (E.G., SITE-SPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.